SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by low, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

		,							
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS					
BRIAN DONEGAN				NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant					
(c) Attornov's (Firm No	me, Address, Telephone N	umber and Tree!! Add							
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na Craig Thor Kimmel, E		imber and Email Add	iress)	NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.					
Kimmel & Silverman,									
30 E. Butler Pike				Attorneys (If Known)					
Ambler, PA 19002									
(215) 540-8888			+						
II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	Piace on "X" in C	ne Box for	Plaintiff
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only)		Incorporated or Pr	and One Box fo incipal Place		
O 2 U.S. Government Defendant	Ø 4 Diversity		Citiza	en of Another State	J 2	Incorporated and I	Principal Place	C) 5	O 5
Detendan	(Indicate Citizenshi	p of Parties in Item III)				of Business In Another State			
				en or Subject of a (reign Country	J 3	Foreign Nation		O 6	O 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Boy Or	nly)	<u> </u>	resku z oumry					
CONTRACT	TO	RTS	SSSS SSST	DEFETTUREMENTALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER	STATUT	PS 200 200
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		0 Agriculture		al 28 USC 158	O 400 State Re		
☐ 120 Marine	(I) 310 Airplane	362 Personal injury		O Other Food & Drug	☐ 423 With		O 450 Antitrus		
130 Miller Act 140 Negotinble Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability	Med. Malpractic 365 Personal Injury		5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	28 0	SC 157	430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation		
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	(J 320 Assault, Libel &	Product Liability	0 63	0 Liquor Laws		RUYRIGHTS			
& Enforcement of Judgment 153 Medicare Act		☐ 368 Asbestos Persona		10 R.R. & Truck	(J 820 Copy		170 Rackete		
(J 152 Recovery of Defaulted	330 Federal Employers' Liability	Injury Product Liability		50 Airline Regs. 50 Occupational		330 Patent 840 Trademark		Organizati ser Credit	ions
Student Loans	340 Marine	PERSONAL PROPER		Safety/Health	10 4.5 11.44	CHI MI K	□ 480 Consum □ 490 Cable/S		
(Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment	345 Marine Product Liability	370 Other Fraud371 Truth in Lending		O Other LABOR	Na lawasi a da na in mare		810 Selectiv		200
of Velemn's Benefits	O 350 Motor Vehicle	371 Frem in Lending		O Fair Labor Standards	© 861 HIA	SECURITY (1395M)	850 Securiti Exchan		dities/
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	Property Damage	:	Act	(7 862 Blac)	k Lung (923)	☐ 875 Custom	er Challeng	gc
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability	385 Property Damage Product Liability		O Labor/Mgmt, Relations O Labor/Mgmt, Reporting		C/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC		
☐ 196 Franchise	lnjury	rroduct Liability	" دا	& Disclosure Act	☐ 864 SSID ☐ 865 RSI (☐ 890 Other S ☐ 891 Agricult		cuons
REAL PROPERTY	SEECIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO		0 Railway Labor Act	***FEDER	AL/TAX/SUITS	☐ 892 Econom	iic Stabiliza	
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	O 441 Voting O 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vaca Sentence		O Other Labor Litigation H Empl. Ret. Inc.		s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	☐ 893 Enviror ☐ 894 Energy		
	1			Security Act		-Third Party	895 Freedon		
240 Torts to Land	Torts to Land Accommodations 530 General				26 U	SC 7609	Act		
	Tort Product Liability				2 Naturalization Application			of Fee Dete Iqual Acces	
a bream same meaning				3 Habeas Corpus -				iqual Acces ic	33
	446 Amer, w/Disabilities - S55 Prison Condition			Alien Detainee	i		☐ 950 Constitutionality of		
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights		D 46	55 Other Immigration Actions			State Statutes		
Ø1 Original ☐ 2 R	late Court	Appellate Court	Reo	pened anot	isferred from her district cify)	6 Multidistr Litigation	rict 🗇 7 🖟	Appeal to udge from dagistrate udgment	n e
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Cite the U.S.C. SEE Sta	tule under which you a I ION 1692	re filing ((Do not cite jurisdictio	nal statutes u	nless diversity):			5
	Fair Debt Colle	use: ction Practices A	ct						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTION 23	N D	EMAND S		HECK YES only URY DEMAND		complain O No	ıt:
VIII. RELATED CAS	(See instructions):	JUDGE		1	DOCKE	ET NUMBER			
Explanation:				$\overline{\gamma}$					
4/8/11		SICNATION	E ATTO	DNEW OF DECORD					
DATE		SIGNATURE O	r ATTO	RNEY OF RECORD					

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Brian Don	egan	:		CIVIL ACTION				
v.		:						
NCO Financ	ial Syster	ns.lnc.		NO.				
In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for claintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of claintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of claims the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track of which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.								
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:								
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cas	ses brought unde	r 28 U.S.C. § 224	1 through § 22	255.	()			
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.								
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.								
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.								
(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)								
(f) Standard Manageme	nt – Cases that d	o not fall into any	one of the oth	er tracks.	X			
4 8 1 Date 215-540 - 8888	_	her Kimime I ey-at-law 18-2864		n Donegan orney for mel@areditla	<u></u> <u>v.Ce</u> m			
Telephone FAX Number E-Mail Address								

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar.	used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of
Address of Plaintiff: 402 Castleton View Road	Castleton VA 22716
Address of Defendant: 507 Prodential Road, Harsha	
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	
(Use Reverse Side For Add	
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and	· /
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes□ No□
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes No W
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	B. M
Case Number:Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered sult pending or within one year	_/
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit	YesD NoLY t nending or within one year previously terminated
action in this court?	periong of mann one you periodicy terminated
2 Paradition of the state of th	Ycs□ No□
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier nur	
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No□
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights of	/
	Yes□ No□
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. D FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. Assault, Defamation
4. □ Antitrust	4. Marine Personal Injury
5. Patent	5. © Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please
- Manage straing Sentence Transferring	specify)
7. Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability
8. Habeas Corpus	8. © Products Liability — Asbestos
9. Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. A All other Federal Question Cases 5 U.S.C. 1692	(France appears)
(Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CERTIF	
J. Check Appropriate Cate, counsel of record do hereby certify:	• • •
Pursuany to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and be	llef, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; C Relief other than monetary damages Is sought.	
410/4 Cos Hous Kinner	67.5
DATE: 1811 JULY 1/NOTUL	<u> </u>
Agroney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	Attorney I.D.# has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or wi except as noted above.	thin one year previously terminated action in this court
DATE: 4/8/11 Craig Than Kimmel	_57165
Atlomey-at-Law CIV. 609 (6/08)	Attorney I.D.#

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE

2	ſ	R THE T OF PENNSYLVANIA					
3 4							
5	BRIAN DONEGAN,))					
6	Plaintiff	,))					
7	v.	Case No.:					
8	NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.,	COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR					
9	Defendant) JURY TRIAL)					
10		(Unlawful Debt Collection Practices)					
11							
12	COM	PLAINT					
13	BRIAN DONEGAN ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, KIMMEL &						
14	SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS						
15 16	INC. ("Defendant"):						
17	INTRO	DUCTION					
18	1. Plaintiff's Complaint is ba	sed on the Fair Debt Collection Practices					
19 20	Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"	").					
21	JURISDICTIO	ON AND VENUE					
22	2. Jurisdiction of this court	arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d)					
23	which states that such actions may be l	brought and heard before "any appropriate					
24 25	United States district court without reg	ard to the amount in controversy," and 28					

U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.

- Defendant conducts business and has an office in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
 - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).
- 5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Castleton, Virginia, 22716.
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 8. Also, Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).
- 9. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road in Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044.
- 10. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.

11. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.
- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false,

]]

deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively

disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. At all relevant times, Defendant was attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt from Plaintiff.
- 16. The alleged debt at issue arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 17. Beginning in or around March 2010 and continuing through June 2010, Defendant made continuous and repeated calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged consumer debt.
- 18. On a number of occasions, Plaintiff received phone calls and messages on his answering machine from Defendant at the following phone number: (800) 485-2202, which the undersigned has confirmed belongs to Defendant.
- 19. Defendant placed repeated calls to Plaintiff's home telephone almost every day, causing Plaintiff to receive, at times, more than twenty (20) collection calls a month.
- 20. Plaintiff does not owe any debt to NCO or any other debt collection company.
 - 21. On or about April 20, 2010, Plaintiff spoke with Defendant and

disputed owing any debt to NCO or any other company that may have retained NCO to collect a debt.

- 22. Defendant acknowledged that Plaintiff did not owe any debt and informed Plaintiff that his phone number had been removed from its computer system.
 - 23. Defendant assured Plaintiff that it would not call him again.
- 24. Despite Defendant's statements to cease calling Plaintiff, Defendant continued to contact Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for a debt he did not owe.
- 25. Then, on or about May 14, 2010, Plaintiff again spoke with Defendant and disputed owing any debt to NCO or any other company that may retained NCO to collect a debt.
- 26. Defendant acknowledged that Plaintiff did not owe any debt and again told Plaintiff that his phone number had been removed from its computer system.
- 27. Once again, Defendant assured Plaintiff that it would not contact him again.
- 28. However, Defendant continued to make continuous and repeated telephone calls to Plaintiff, calling him as recently as June 9, 2010.
- 29. Upon information and belief, Defendant sought to collect a debt from Plaintiff despite the fact that it had knowledge that Plaintiff did not owe the debt.

30. Defendant's actions in attempting to collect the alleged debt were harassing, abusive and highly deceptive.

CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

- 31. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 32. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).
- 33. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v.

22

23 24

25

Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the 34. FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
 - a. Defendant violated of the FDCPA generally;
 - b. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff in connection with the collection of an alleged debt;
 - c. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused the Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;

1	7
J	8
1	9
2	0

23 24

25

d.	Defendant	violated	§1692e	of	the	FDCPA	by	using	false
	deceptive,	or mislea	ding repr	eser	itatio	ns or mea	ans i	in conn	ection
	with the co	llection of	a debt;						

- e. Defendant violated §1692e(2) of the FDCPA by falsely representing the character, amount, or legal status of any debt;
- f. Defendant violated §1692e(10) of the FDCPA by using false representations or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- g. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- h. Defendant violated §1692f(1) of the FDCPA by collecting an amount not expressly authorized by the agreement creating the debt or permitted by law; and
- i. Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, BRIAN DONEGAN, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

> a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);

- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, BRIAN DONEGAN, demands a jury trial in this case.

DATED: 4/8/11

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

By:

Craig Thor Kirhmel Attorney ID # 57100

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike

Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888

Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com